

## REMARKS

### *Summary*

Amended independent Claims 9 and 28, and newly-added independent Claims 150, 159, 170, 179, 190, and 199 recite at least one feature not disclosed or suggested in the cited art. Therefore, is the outstanding rejection still proper?

### *Status of the Claims*

Claims 9, 28, and 150-209 are pending in the application. Claims 10-27 and 29-149 have been canceled without prejudice. Claims 9 and 28 have been amended. Claims 150-209 have been added to recite additional novel features of the present invention. Claims 9, 28, 150, 159, 170, 179, 190, and 199 are independent.

### *Requested Action*

Applicant respectfully requests the Office to reconsider and withdraw the outstanding rejection in view of the foregoing amendment and the following remarks.

### *Substantive Rejection*

Claims 9-149 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Nos. 5,038,320 (Heath) and 5,083,262 (Haff, Jr.).

### *Response to Substantive Rejection*

In the response, while not conceding the propriety of the rejection, Applicant has canceled Claims 10-27 and 29-149, amended Claims 9 and 28, and added Claims 150-209.

Applicant submits that as amended, independent Claims 9 and 28 and newly-added independent Claims 150, 159, 170, 179, 190, and 199 are allowable over these citations for the following reasons.

A. Claims 9, 150, 170, and 190

Independent Claim 150 relates to an information processing apparatus comprising connection means, recognition means, and reading means.

The connection means is for connecting a detachable external device to the apparatus.

The recognition means is for recognizing connection of the external device to the apparatus by the connection means and recognizing a device type of the connected external device based on data stored in the external device.

The read means is responsive to the recognition means recognizing the device connection and the device type, and is for reading a device driver for the connected external device either from the external device through the connection means or from a memory area provided in the apparatus.

The Heath patent was cited for showing slots 2-0 to 2-7 for connecting an external device such as an I/O option card 5-1 to 5-7 to a system board 1 and a CPU 8 for executing a program for loading an ID signal for the external device. The Haff patent was cited for showing loading of a program code into a system memory through an interface from a portable external device.

But neither of these patents is understood to disclose or suggest read means, responsive to recognition means recognizing connection of an external device to an

information processing apparatus and recognizing the type of connected external device, for reading a device driver for a connected external device either from the external device through connection means or from a memory area provided in the information processing apparatus, as recited by Claim 150.

The failure of these references to disclose or suggest at least this feature proves fatal to establishing a prima facie case of obviousness against Claim 150, since MPEP §2142, requires that:

To establish a prima facie case of obviousness... the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations.

Thus, for this reason, Claim 150 is allowable over the applied art.

And, since Claim 9 has been amended to recite these features of Claim 150 and since Claims 170 and 190 are corresponding method and storage medium claims that recite similar features, they are all allowable for similar reasons.

**B. Claims 28, 159, 179, and 199**

Independent Claim 159 relates to an information processing apparatus comprising connection means, recognition means, and reading means.

The connection means is for connecting a detachable external device to the apparatus.

The recognition means is for recognizing connection of the external device to the apparatus by the connection means and recognizing a device type of the connected external device based on data stored in the external device.

The read means is responsive to the recognition means recognizing the device type, and is for making a determination whether a device driver for the connected external device is to be read from the external device through the connection means, and reading the device driver in accordance with the determination.

In contrast, neither the Health patent nor the Haff patent is understood to disclose or suggest read means, responsive to recognition means recognizing the type of external device connected to an information processing apparatus, for making a determination whether a device driver for the external device is to be read from the external device through connection means, and reading the device driver in accordance with the determination, as recited by Claim 159.

The failure of these references to disclose or suggest at least this feature proves fatal to establishing a prima facie case of obviousness against Claim 159, since MPEP §2142, requires that:

To establish a prima facie case of obviousness... the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations.

Thus, for this reason, Claim 159 is allowable over the applied art.

And, since Claim 28 has been amended to recite these features of Claim 159 and since Claims 179 and 199 are corresponding method and storage medium claims that recite similar features, they are all allowable for similar reasons.

The dependent claims are allowable for the reasons given with respect to the independent claims and because they recite features which are patentable in their own right. Individual consideration of the dependent claims is respectfully solicited.


The other art of record is also not understood to disclose or suggest the inventive concept of the present invention as defined by the claims.

In view of the above amendments and remarks, the claims are now in allowable form. Therefore, early passage to issue is respectfully solicited.

Applicants' undersigned attorney may be reached in our Washington, D.C. office by telephone at (202) 530-1010. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below-listed address.



Respectfully submitted,

  
Attorney for Applicants  
Registration No. 28,861

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO  
30 Rockefeller Plaza  
New York, New York 10112-3801  
Facsimile No.: (212) 218-2200

RECEIVED  
APR 18 2000  
TC 2800 MAIL ROOM